



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **REPORT**

  

## **33<sup>rd</sup> TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS**

**(VIRTUAL SESSION NO 1) 06 OCTOBER  
2021**

**ROME, ITALY**

**IPPC Secretariat**

## Required citation

IPPC Secretariat. 2021 33<sup>rd</sup> *Technical Consultation among RPPOS* 6 October 2021 Session 1

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2021



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition.

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

**Third-party materials.** Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

**Sales, rights and licensing.** FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org)

## Contents

<b>1. Opening of the Meeting .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2 Welcome by the TC-RPPO Chairperson .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Meeting arrangements.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1 Selection of a Rapporteur.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 Adoption of the agenda.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Administrative matters .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.1 Documents list .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.2 Participants list.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Strategic issues .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.1 Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System, Emerging pests, NRO, Data Reporting Tool (DART) and Partnership/Collaboration with the International Society for Pest Information .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.2 Partnership/Collaboration with the International Society for Pest Information.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.3 Review of ECOWAS's application to be an RPPO.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4.4 Guidance for new heads of RPPOs to contribute to the IPPC mandate.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.5 Laboratory Diagnostic Networking: Developing agenda of the IPPC Strategic Framework</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.6 Amendments of Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of TC-RPPO .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5. Future plans .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.1 Date and arrangement of the next meeting.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. Other Business .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7. Close of the Meeting .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Appendix 1: Agenda .....	15
Appendix 2: Participants list.....	16
<b>33<sup>RD</sup> TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>VIRTUAL MEETING N° 01.....</b>	<b>16</b>

## **1. Opening of the Meeting**

### **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat**

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat opened the first session in the series of virtual meetings of the 33rd TC-RPPO. Participants were informed that the work done by the 33rd TC-RPPO in these meetings would be reported to the CPM-16 in April 2022.

### **1.2 Welcome by the TC-RPPO Chairperson**

- [2] Chairperson Mr Visoni TIMOTE, welcomed the TC-RPPO colleagues and participants from the Secretariat.

## **2. Meeting arrangements**

### **2.1 Selection of a Rapporteur**

- [3] Mr Nico HORN volunteered as the TC-RPPO Rapporteur.

### **2.2 Adoption of the agenda**

- [4] The Secretariat asked if the agenda could be slightly changed for the Secretariat's oral presentations to be the first point of the meeting agenda, followed by the ECOWAS application to be the eleventh RPPO. The Chairperson proposed to colleagues to approve the agenda change.
- [5] Before adopting the agenda, members of EPPO and NAPPO noted the late posting of the documents for Diagnostic Laboratory Networking and the draft to amend Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the TC-RPPO. More time was requested to evaluate the documents before proceeding with a discussion. They asked why these documents were posted late online.
- [6] The NAPPO member also requested the agenda item 4.4 'Guidance for New Heads of RPPO to Contribute' be removed from the agenda.
- [7] For other business, the Chairperson and NAPPO proposed to discuss information about RPPO challenges to be presented in the NAPPO annual meeting under Agenda item 6. The member from EPPO concluded that it is essential to have enough RPPOs present and to receive timely document submissions to review material in advance to be prepared for discussion. A motion by NAPPO to remove 4.4 and defer agenda items 4.5, and 4.6 to the next virtual meeting was supported by members from CAHFSA and EPPO.
- [8] The Chairperson thanked the member from EPPO with comments about the agenda items and about the late submission of documents.
- [9] The member from NAPPO agreed with EPPO. With respect to the agenda item 4.6 amendments to the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure, the document was provided to all the RPPOs and to the Secretariat on August 25. It was somewhat of a surprise to see that it was uploaded late. It is an important document for all the RPPOs and it was suggested that discussion on that agenda item be deferred to the next TC-RPPO meeting.
- [10] The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to respond in this regard. The Secretariat confirmed that an email with the draft document was addressed to everyone on 25 August. There was an expectation or understanding that comments would be back in time for posting by the submission date. Since no comments were sent or received after that date, the draft document was posted just prior to the meeting.

- [11] The document for the diagnostic laboratory network was received after the submission date and posted as meeting preparations were being finalized.
- [12] The IPPC Secretariat apologized and proposed for the discussion on diagnostic laboratory network be moved to the next virtual session to give more time to consult experts.
- [13] The Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for responding in that regard. Before moving on, the member from EPPO noted that not all the RPPOs were present, which is essential for some of the agenda items. He expressed all the important agenda items of this meeting could be skipped. Thus, reducing this meeting to some items of just informing each other on the state of play on some documents. He added that this decreases the value of the TC-RPPO enormously. Purposely being a bit provocative because it is essential to have enough RPPOs present.
- [14] The Chairperson proceeded to the Secretariat's oral presentation followed by the agenda item for ECOWAS application to be the 11th RPPO.

### 3. Administrative matters

#### 3.1 Documents list

- [15] The following documents were posted for this meeting:

- - VM01\_01\_TC-RPPO\_2021\_OCT\_Agenda
- - VM01\_00\_TC-RPPO\_2021\_OCT\_Documents list
- - VM01\_00\_TC-RPPO\_2021\_OCT\_Participants list
- - VM01\_00\_TC-RPPO\_2021\_OCT\_Review of ECOWAS's application to be recognized as an RPPO
- - VM01\_00\_TC-RPPO\_2021\_OCT\_Laboratory Diagnostics Networking: Development of the IPPC Strategic Framework

#### 3.2 Participants list

- [16] The following participants were in attendance:

RPPO representatives:

- - Mr. Visoni TIMOTE (PPPO)
- - Ms. Juliet GOLDSMITH (CAHFSA)
- - Ms Katty Rojas (CAN)
- - Mr. Nico M. HORN (EPPO)
- - Mr Jean Gérard MEZUI M'ELLA (IAPSC)
- - Ms. Stephanie BLOEM (NAPPO)
- - Mr. Mekki CHOUIBANI (NEPPO))
- - Mr César DE LA CRUZ (COSAVE)
- - Mr Josué Carrasco VALIENTE (COSAVE), and Mr Carlos Ramon URIAS (OIRSA) - Mr. Yubak DHOJ G. C. (APPPC) did not attend.

Observers:

- - Mr Benoit GNONLONFIN (ECOWAS)

- - Mr Sy Alain TRAORE (ECOWAS)
- - Ms Luiza MBURA MUNYUA (IAPSC)
- - Ms Jovita AKIUMBENI (IAPSC)

IPPC Secretariat staff:

- - Ms Sarah BRUNEL
- - Mr John GILMORE
- - Mr Riccardo MAZZUCHELLI
- - Ms Adriana MOREIRA
- - Ms Natalie NICORA

## 4. Strategic issues

### 4.1 Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System, Emerging pests, NRO, Data Reporting Tool (DART) and Partnership/Collaboration with the International Society for Pest Information

- [17] The IPPC Secretariat orally presented the combined agenda items on the Partnership and Collaboration with the International Society for Pest Information, the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System (POARS) on emerging pests, the National Reporting Obligations (NRO), and the Data Reporting Tool (DART).
- [18] The CPM (Commission on Phytosanitary Measures) Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System established last year has been meeting virtually every month for three hours to achieve a considerable amount of work. In addition to monthly virtual focus group meetings, there were side meetings to make cross references on emerging pests in the strategic framework that were limited to quarantine pests or potential quarantine pests.
- [19] The side meetings reflected how various systems around the world are working in cooperation with FAO project units in charge of emerging pests and response systems activities on the ground. Presentation sessions were also organized whereby managers of existing pest outbreak alert and response systems presented details on the operations of their systems. The group sought knowledge about various existing pest outbreak and alert response systems from EPPO, NAPPO, the USA, Australia, and OIE among others. A study describing many of the POARS activities was drafted and will be published in 2022.
- [20] The Focus Group moved forward while the Standards Committee was asked to consider a request for a Technical Panel on Glossary on emerging pests. There are new efforts to define many terms such as preparedness, emergency response, etc.... to be added in a future Terms Glossary. Terms related to various components of new pest detections and their outbreaks will take innovative effort for harmonized terms to be defined when undertaking challenges of a Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System.
- [21] This activity should liaise with stakeholders from the private sector, as well as National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPO) and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPO) and how donors could fund activities in the future. Liaising with NPPOs is a strong feature of the entire system with considerations related to the information system and tools.
- [22] A recommendation to create a dedicated web page easily accessible in various languages could be part of a toolbox that would contain various guides, training materials, and other resources.

Various presentations demonstrated the need to establish an automated process to scan the media and the scientific sources for information.

- [23] The animal health emergency unit performs this function in the FAO Emergency Prevention System (EMPRES) and it is also done in the OIE. The World Health Organization provides the initial tool called E.I.O.S. and that could be a design for plant health as well. Suggestions are to connect as much pest information as possible with expertise on diagnostic surveillance and eradication to all the competencies necessary to be effectively tackling an emerging pest.
- [24] Because the IC already has many tasks, there is a suggestion to form a new body in charge of pest outbreak and response systems that is not under the Implementation Committee (IC).
- [25] The reason for a new body is to ensure POARS has the visibility it should receive. A new body could handle this activity and would function a little bit under the same pattern as an IC subgroup in terms of emerging pests.
- [26] For instance, the subgroup sets criteria by determining which species should be assessed and considers the best reporting part of the national reporting obligations that should be under this new committee. There were suggestions on how these groups might function and which resources are needed for which species. The links with the other emergency response bodies could keep a new committee flexible with a limited number of expert members from the various regions to allow rapid decision making in pest emergencies.
- [27] An organigram is proposed, as well as taking steps to approach the animal health emergency unit. Being highly effective in the field, this new emergency response group could be the one that countries approach just as they are for animal health interventions.
- [28] The program of the work plan would be kept in the strategic framework for 2020 - 2030 that was noted in CPM. Advances have been made to get a clear picture of all the existing systems and to publish a study next year. The paper will detail activities that should be embedded when such a mission on the ground is conducted.

## 4.2 Partnership/Collaboration with the International Society for Pest Information

- [29] During the last TC-RPPO meeting the member from NAPPO introduced a database named the International Society for Pest Information.
- [30] In addition to this database, the Secretariat reminded members that in the last meeting a Wiki database with contributions from various contributing scientists had been presented for consideration. It is one of many resource databases that exist. The focus group did not have any specific recommendations on a database and left it up to the TC-RPPO that maybe one of the RPPO's would like to give this database a try. It was not picked up by the focus group because there were many recommendations made to inform the members in terms of emerging pests already known.
- [31] The IPPC Secretariat also reported that within the IPPC Secretariat there is a FAO IPPC technical working group actively working on Fall Army Worm and quarantine and phytosanitary measures. New guidelines for prevention, preparedness, and response were recently released with three webinars organized for October, November, and December 2021.
- [32] This set the stage for working on a species in terms of prevention and the emergency response of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4 (TR4) and how to prevent its spread.

- [33] The IC top experts recently met for the first time to review existing resources to consider, such as which activities need to be developed and implemented to facilitate capacity development, and pest awareness and pest prevention on a global level.
- [34] The Secretariat reported on National Reporting Obligations (NROs) and the proposed TOR for a new subgroup which has almost been agreed upon. Once approved the IC will determine available resources, then a call for NRO experts will be announced. The IC team is working on NROs where they were discussed in the 2021 Regional Workshops.
- [35] Referring to the DART tool, a data reporting tool managed by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the IC organized a presentation session for the POARS focus group to better understand what this tool is and how it could be used. The tool is theoretical, and the focus group does not see IPPC using it and did not make any specific recommendation regarding the DART database. The Secretariat concluded the presentation and opened for questions.
- [36] The Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the combined updates and opened the floor for discussion.
- [37] The EPPO colleague asked how to use the available information, noting the existing information on worldwide information occurrence of pathogens and insects. Not all are pests in the IPPC sense. Distinguishing between published scientific literature and that which is not recognized officially from the NPPO is not always clear. It was asked if the way the pest outbreak response system will work is considered by the International Society of Pest Information.
- [38] The Secretariat mentioned in the context of the focus groups that they did not get deep into details because there were many tasks. One of the tasks was about setting criteria to understand or determine which task will be considered.
- [39] The focus group is still working to identify a definition with initial criteria, but they decided that there should be another small subgroup under the new committee to really define what to do. There are no final conclusions for now.
- [40] In terms of the database, another issue is how to show the information. The idea that something should be on the IPP (International Phytosanitary Portal), but it is not intended to reinvent the wheel, so there should be connections with existing databases like EPPO and others. The IPP could connect to the system with literature and unofficial reports.
- [41] The difference is clearly understood between pest distribution from the literature and from an official report. Therefore, the group had input from the legal office whether the IPPC contracting parties can use an open system to search the internet or not. The idea of an open system that scrolls the web for published pest information could be used publicly or if it could be challenged by countries.
- [42] The OIE does this, and they have a dedicated person scrolling the web or information, but they do not publish that publicly. It is a way to engage countries about the situation in their country, and it is an incentive for the country to report. The NRO team and subgroup will be picking up the recommendation to consider what to do.
- [43] Thanking the Secretariat, EPPO representative stated it is crucial to know the initial choice of work needed before work begins on POARS or if contacting databases could not be deferred to a later stage.
- [44] The Secretariat added that what is known and what is officially published are two different things in the way information is processed.



- [45] The EPPO member expressed it differently, what is known from literature and what is known officially from NPPOs is different. Knowing the value of the information is not always easy, especially with no proof. Sometimes when the information is checked, it is not always true. Sometimes written literature can have misidentification. He continued that a group established under the IPPC focuses on what is officially recorded, but it does not say you cannot give alerts for other things. Sometimes emerging pests may not be regulated elsewhere.
- [46] The representative from NAPPO asked if someone will follow-up with the folks from International Society for Pest Information or if the Secretariat will. The matter of the database has been left open and it is not clear whether to use it or not. It is a valuable source of information and was brought to the group's attention to use as another resource for the toolbox.
- [47] The representative from NAPPO asked if there is going to be an update for the IC on the activities of the POARS focus group. It was not confirmed because the focus group was going to report to the Strategic Planning Group and then to CPM, but it does not prevent an update to the IC.
- [48] If the IC was going to be updated, then the member from NAPPO could wait before writing to the people from the International Society for Pest Information.
- [49] The Secretariat noted it really does not make a difference if there is an IC update or not and asked if the member from NAPPO would like to introduce this database to the other IC members in case someone would like to work on it. It could not be confirmed if it would be an opportunity or an option.
- [50] The member from NAPPO agreed with the suggestion and in the meantime will mention to the folks in the International Society for Pest Information what was reported to ensure they are aware of what is going on.
- [51] The Chairperson gave the floor to the ECOWAS representative to comment on the topic.
- [52] The ECOWAS representative referred to the work on an integrated action plan to record all the existing plant pests and diseases within the ECOWAS region. This important work has also been in cooperation with FAO on a lot of networking development in animal health issues. They have epidemiology surveillance and a laboratory network with the 15 member states.
- [53] ECOWAS is building a strong task force with NPPOs in the member states to create synergies. Many of the plant health issues related to growing crops in ecological zones may be a little bit different compared to other parts of the world. This is a welcome development, and they are looking forward to seeing how they can better collaborate and contribute. It is one reason they are requesting to be an RPPO.
- [54] The Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the presentation and to the ECOWAS colleague for contributing remarks to the discussion.

#### **4.3 Review of ECOWAS's application to be an RPPO**

- [55] The Chairperson invited the colleague from IAPSC to give an update on ECOWAS's application to be recognized as the eleventh RPPO.
- [56] The colleague from the African Union (AU) welcomed the participants and gave an update of IAPSC since the 32nd TC-RPPO meeting in February 2021. (Doc available here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90279/>). He discussed the activity of the ECOWAS request to be recognized as the eleventh RPPO and on partnerships, collaborations, constraints, and a way forward.

- [57] The IAPSC colleague received a letter from the Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Economies (DARDE) for an update on this topic.
- [58] IAPSC provided an appropriate response to the Commission and explained that it is up to the African Union Commission to provide a response back to the ECOWAS Commissioner. As a course ahead, some of the members of the head of state may make this decision in a general assembly.
- [59] The IAPSC member gave a technical explanation about the role of the RPPO to the Commissioner. No decision was taken by the African Union in conformity with its internal regulations with the different Regional Economic Communities to recognize ECOWAS as an RPPO.
- [60] The IAPSC colleague presented an update on partnerships and collaboration in the new plant health strategy with different stakeholders and touched on the list of pests and diseases of concern. Wrapping up the presentation on the way forward looking at addressing staffing limitations, the programme budget to be stepped up, and developing a post Covid-19 outbreak contingency plan.
- [61] The Chairperson thanked the colleague from IAPSC and opened the floor for questions.
- [62] The ECOWAS representative thanked the IAPSC colleague for the presentation and stated that he was expecting more information regarding the point of the agenda about the ECOWAS' update to request to be an RPPO. Calling attention to the ECOWAS document provided, indicating all the procedures and the rules established to be an RPPO has been followed by ECOWAS.
- [63] ECOWAS is an economic community organization that follows the rules and mandate as part of the African Union that is a Commission, not an Executive Secretariat. As a potential RPPO, ECOWAS will implement all the decisions at the African Union level that is taken by the head of state as a member at the African Union with all the international regulations in the ECOWAS regulatory framework.
- [64] This is a key reason ECOWAS applied, and with expectations to receive strong information from the IAPSC Director. He asked what the IAPSC reserve is to the application.
- [65] ECOWAS is working with the understanding of an RPPO view and the balances in between various members. There are not a lot of institutions in West Africa on plant health and animal health issues. The only organization in West Africa is the OIE on animal health issues. The IPPC and IAPSC are for plant health and is a reason for the request to be an RPPO.
- [66] As a Commission member, ECOWAS can play a better role by informing the international bodies, and better informing the African Union with contributions in the international arena regarding plant health and other disease issues in West Africa. Comments concluded with thanks to the IAPSC colleague for the presentation.
- [67] The Chairperson thanked the ECOWAS colleague and gave the floor to the colleague from NEPPO.
- [68] The NEPPO colleague regretted that colleagues from other regions were absent. He explained that work in the framework of the IPPC article nine encourages countries to establish the regional organisations in their respective area.

- [69] He asked if the confusion is between technical or political aspects and what the difference is working in the framework of IPPC and with 15 country members in ECOWAS. The criteria to establish an RPPO was developed and adopted by CPM.
- [70] The member from IAPSC explained that it is not his decision to make because IAPSC works under the organization of the African Union Commission. In the African Commission, IAPSC is the extension in the International Organization.
- [71] As the recognized RPPO, IAPSC gives the technical information of the African Union to all the 55 African members. When one division wants to be an RPPO, it is not a decision that will be decided by the Director of IAPSC. The IAPSC Director was asked to brief the Africa Union Commissioner on the ECOWAS official proposal to be an RPPO. The process is ongoing, and the decision will be taken by the member states of the African Union, not by IAPSC. IAPSC is not blocking the process, but it is the same decision that was made in the last TC-RPPO meeting to respect the mandate of the African Union mission.
- [72] The colleague from EPPO stated that the Technical Consultation among RPPOs have examples in the world where countries are members from more than one RPPO, and that does not prevent the functioning of the country or the RPPO, and it helps to collaborate better.
- [73] He added that the TC-RPPO should focus on what is outlined in paragraph two of the document and assess whether the prospective RPPO meets the criteria. There are four minimum functions, and if the TC-RPPO decides to report to CPM that ECOWAS fulfils the criteria, yes or no. No decision could be made at this meeting, but the TC-RPPO cannot go beyond the procedure subscribed for recognition.
- [74] The member from NAPPO expressed the same points and added that the legal review of the documentation provided by ECOWAS concluded that ECOWAS met the criteria.
- [75] For the TC-RPPO, the decision is if ECOWAS fulfils the criteria to become an RPPO.
- [76] The member from NEPPO emphasized that his region shares six member states with the African Union, four countries with EPPO, and one country with APPPC, and this is the will of the government to establish regional plant protection organizations. It is not the will of some technician; it is the will of the government, and it is like the same thing for ECOWAS. The TC-RPPO respects the will of the CPM.
- [77] The Chairperson concluded by stating it comes down to the issue of governance regarding what IAPSC restrictions are from the technical areas, but that ECOWAS has met all the recommendations.
- [78] The colleague from EPPO apologized for lengthening the conversation by stating that it should be clear in separating what the task of the TC-RPPO is, while on the other hand recognizing the point that if ECOWAS does not have the sovereign authority to submit a proposal, then if they are under the hierarchy of the African Union, then they should discuss this internally.
- [79] In this case ECOWAS should withdraw the request, but it means that the whole analysis of the FAO Legal Office means that ECOWAS does have its own power to apply to be an RPPO. Stating clearly to separate these two issues that if anyone has the authority and the sovereignty to apply for an RPPO, then TC-RPPO can only say it fulfils the criteria. If the African Union thinks ECOWAS does not have sovereign authority to do so, then that is something that must be solved by the African Union, but not by the TC-RPPO.

- [80] The Director of ECOWAS apologized but wanted to clarify that ECOWAS is an autonomous organization and has sovereignty by the treaty establishing ECOWAS and a decision was made to follow the procedures and the rules of an RPPO.
- [81] He recognized that politically ECOWAS respects the African Union and all the mandatory obligations that they have. And it is simply because the reservation was made by IAPSC on the point that ECOWAS cannot be an RPPO when all the other members agree that the criteria is met. It is a reason in diplomacy and respecting the rules, the Commissioner for Agriculture of ECOWAS wrote to his colleague to explain why ECOWAS made an application. He asked why the director of IAPSC has a reservation, because it is not in line with the rules and procedures to establish an RPPO in IPPC.
- [82] The point is that if ECOWAS has autonomy and sovereignty as members of OIE, the WTO SPS, then they have the right to become an RPPO. They are ready to fulfil obligations of an RPPO and to follow rules and procedures. As an observer, the Director of ECOWAS thanked the TC-RPPO for clarifying some key points.
- [83] It was suggested to take this subject to the next meeting with all TC-RPPO members encouraged to be present and to have a quorum.
- [84] The Secretariat asked if the TC-RPPO decides by consensus or a majority. Advice from FAO legal is according to the Rules of Procedure with the TC-RPPO that the decisions to be made by consensus.
- [85] The member from NAPPO referred to the draft document on the Terms of Reference and Rules and Procedures that deferred discussion for the next TC-RPPO meeting. In the new paragraph 34 of the document posted, the reference to Rule six is decision making.
- [86] As previously mentioned, decisions will be taken by consensus whenever possible, but it also says from the Drafting Group that decisions be taken by simple majority of the RPPOs present at the meeting. In situations where a decision is taken by simple majority or when a consensus decision cannot be reached, it shall be described in the meeting report detailing all the positions expressed.
- [87] The Chairperson thanked the NAPPO colleague for the clarity around decision making in the document. Given all the views that have been raised he asked if a vote should be taken now or postponed until the next meeting.
- [88] It was agreed that a decision be deferred until the following meeting when all are present, or another option would be for an official communication from the IPPC secretariat to all RPPOs to express their view through correspondence. Then review for a decision could be made at the next meeting.
- [89] The Secretariat acknowledged both are good options but added that a message was sent to all the members of the TC-RPPO for written correspondence prior to this meeting, or at least to get their thoughts. Unfortunately, only three comments or positions were received and therefore without sufficient opinions they were not provided for this meeting.
- [90] The Chairperson asked the Secretariat to follow-up to request all RPPOs to attend the next meeting for them to provide insight and valuable feedback before deciding.
- [91] The IAPSC member clarified that RPPOs are not contracting parties and are only observers. IAPSC, the African Union and ECOWAS are not contracting parties. The European Union and the 27 member states are contracting parties.

- [92] The member from CAHFSA noted she would not be in attendance for the meeting scheduled on 28 October and that she could send in a written response. In addition, the 30 November meeting may not have full attendance. The Chairperson asked the Secretariat to send an email for written correspondence for an opinion from all TC-RPPO members and deferred the agenda item to the next TC-RPPO.

#### **4.4 Guidance for new heads of RPPOs to contribute to the IPPC mandate**

- [93] This agenda item was removed until all 10 RPPOs are present.

#### **4.5 Laboratory Diagnostic Networking: Developing agenda of the IPPC Strategic Framework**

- [94] A representative from the IPPC Secretariat Standard Setting Unit did not present the discussion paper in depth because the document was made available late. The TC-RPPO members agreed to move this topic to the second virtual meeting of the 33<sup>rd</sup> TC-RPPO. It was stated that the RPPOs need more time to have inputs from experts within the countries, but it would be good to have some initial discussion with the TC-RPPO.
- [95] General remarks were made that this is really an issue where RPPOs could play a role, so there needs to be a discussion amongst RPPOs on collecting information in the region.
- [96] Without elaborating on this topic, it is still valuable for TC-RPPO to be available to discuss with further input from experts. EPPO's experience with diagnostic protocols, accreditations, and standards for laboratory accreditation will be useful. The Chairperson commented that it is an important topic for the PPPO because all samples in his region are sent to research laboratories in Australia and New Zealand for identification and feedback. He concurred that RPPOs have an opportunity to play a vital role in this coordination.
- [97] The Secretariat noted the Standards Committee (SC) is still trying to understand the concept and the role they could have in a diagnostic laboratory network. They provided insight that the IPPC needs to define better the objectives of a diagnostic laboratory network and what it should and should not include when presenting this topic globally.
- [98] With this basic question, the TC-RPPO could provide insights on this subject. The Chairperson noted that an update from the Secretariat will help the TC-RPPO and requested an opportunity to respond with attributes in this network by the next meeting to identify any gaps.
- [99] The NAPPO colleague asked the IPPC Secretariat set up an e-forum to allow for member countries to discuss and comment on the document. Commenting via an e-forum has been an effective way to provide input at the Implementation Committee level. The TC-RPPO approved the use of the e-forum tool for communicating this topic
- [100] The Secretariat gave information on the operations of the e-forum tool in the IPPC website with controlled access to it.
- [101] The Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for using the e-forum for network and responding to the document on the diagnostic laboratory network.

#### **4.6 Amendments of Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of TC-RPPO**

[102] The TC-RPPO members agreed to move this topic to the second virtual meeting of the 33rd TC-RPPO.

### **5. Future plans**

#### **5.1 Date and arrangement of the next meeting**

[103] The meeting for the 28th of October was cancelled because of schedule conflicts.

[104] The TC-RPPO agreed to use a Doodle poll to find a suitable date for the 2nd virtual session of the 33rd TC-RPPO to be rescheduled from 28 October.

[105] 28 October 2021 is the final day for posting documents.

[106] The Chairperson prefers to maintain the current start time although that is in the middle of the night to avoid high internet traffic during his workday.

### **6. Other Business**

[107] The IPPC Secretariat proposed the following agenda items for the second virtual meeting of 33rd TC-RPPO:

- Amendments to Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of TC-RPPO
- All members of the TC-RPPO are to review the ECOWAS request to be recognized as the eleventh RPPO.

[108] The TC-RPPO requested the IPPC Secretariat to circulate the draft agenda to the RPPOs who will review and provide recommendations for adjustments as needed.

[109] Reminder for participants, following the rules of the TC-RPPO, the term of the current Chairperson ends at the end of the 33rd TC-RPPO meeting and the next chair should be selected to take over this role in the 2022 meeting.

[110] The Secretariat reminded the TC-RPPO to reach out to the NPPOs in their respective regions to vote in the upcoming Secretariat poll to hold CPM-16 virtually. The rules require two-thirds or 123 contracting parties to approve the virtual meeting. Voting should be concluded as soon as possible or no later than November 30th. The Secretariat will remind TC-RPPO in the next virtual meeting to rally the call to get out and vote.

[111] The NAPPO member noted the upcoming virtual NAPPO annual meeting will have close to 500 registered participants from 27 countries, 35 different government agencies within those countries, 50 industry groups within those countries, seven RPPOs, and academic institutions signed up to attend.

[112] A request by the Chairperson was made to put together a presentation about top plant health challenges by RPPOs. Information from a couple of RPPOs has been received, but still needs information from many other RPPOs. Because the meeting is in November, a request was made to the RPPOs present in this meeting to send the information to the Chairperson and NAPPO colleague as soon as possible.

### **7. Close of the Meeting**

[113] The Chairperson closed the meeting and thanked the TC-RPPO colleagues and the IPPC Secretariat for the opportunity to meet virtually.



## Appendix 1: Agenda

### 33<sup>rd</sup> Technical Consultation among RPPOs 1<sup>st</sup> Virtual Session

6 October, 2021

#### Agenda

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		DENG
1.2	Welcome by the TC-RPPO Chairperson		TIMOTE
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		TIMOTE
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	VM01_01_TC-RPPO_2021_Oct	TIMOTE
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		GILMORE
3.1	Documents list	VM01_02_TC-RPPO_2021_Oct	
3.2	Participants list	VM01_03_TC-RPPO_2021_Oct	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Strategic issues<sup>1</sup></b>		
4.1	Update of ECOWAS's application to be recognized as an RPPO	<a href="#">LINK</a>	TC-RPPO Members
4.2	Partnership/collaboration with the International Society for Pest Information	ORAL presentation	BRUNEL
4.3	Pest outbreak Alert and Response System, Emerging pests, NRO and Data Reporting Tool (DART)	ORAL presentation	BRUNEL
4.4	Guidance for new heads of RPPOs to contribute to the IPPC mandate	ORAL Presentation	BLOEM/ GOLDSMITH
4.5	Laboratory Diagnostic Networking: Developing agenda of the IPPC Strategic Framework	VM01_05_TC-RPPO_2021_Oct	MOREIRA/ CASSIN/ MANGILI
4.6	Amendments of Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of TC-RPPO		BLOEM/ CHOUIBANI/ HORN
<b>5.</b>	<b>Future plans</b>		
5.1	Date and arrangement of the next meeting		TIMOTE/ GILMORE
<b>6.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		TIMOTE/GILMORE
<b>7.</b>	<b>Close of the Meeting</b>		TIMOTE/ DENG

<sup>1</sup> As agreed, amendments to Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of TC-RPPO was deferred to the 33<sup>rd</sup> TC-RPPO.

**Appendix 2: Participants list****33<sup>RD</sup> TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS****VIRTUAL MEETING N° 01****Start:** 2021-10-06 at 13:00 (Rome time)**PARTICIPANTS LIST**

List of members attending the meeting.

<b>Present</b>	<b>Region/ Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)	<b>Mr Jean Gérard MEZUI M'ELLA</b> Director of Inter-African Phytosanitary Council of African Union African-Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Council / Conseil Phytosanitaire Inter-Africain de l'Union Africaine P.O.Box 4170 Nlongkak, Yaoundé, Cameroon Tel: (+237) 222 21 19 69, (+237) 694 89 93 40, +237 673275853 Fax: (+237) 222 21 19 67	MezuiJG@africa-union.org; jeangerardmezuimella@gmail.com
✓	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)	<b>Mr Luiza MUNYUA</b> Director of Inter-African Phytosanitary Council of African Union African-Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Council / Conseil Phytosanitaire Inter-Africain de l'Union Africaine P.O.Box 4170 Nlongkak, Yaoundé, Cameroon Tel: (+237) 222 21 19 69, (+237) 694 89 93 40, +237 673275853 Fax: (+237) 222 21 19 67	MunyuaL@africa-union.org;
✓	Near East Plant Protection Organisation (NEPPO)	<b>Mr Mekki CHOUIBANI</b> Executive Director Near East Plant Protection Organisation (NEPPO) NEPPO Batiment C de l'INRA, Angle des Avenues Ibn Al Ouazzani et Hassan II. Rabat. Morocco Tel: +212 537 704 810 Mobile: + 212 673 997 808 Fax: +212 537 7087 63	hq.neppo@gmail.com; chouibani@gmail.com
	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)	<b>Mr Yubak Dhoj G. C.</b> Senior Agricultural Officer (Plant Protection) FAO Regional Office for Asia (RAP) 39 Phra Atit Road Bangkok 10200, Thailand Tel: +662974268 Mobile: +66858758784 Fax: +662 6974445	yubak.gc@fao.org; yubak.gc@yahoo.com
✓	European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)	<b>Mr Nico M. HORN</b> Director-General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO/OEPP) 21 boulevard Richard Lenoir 75011 PARIS FRANCE Tel: + 33 (0) 1 45 20 77 94	nico.horn@epppo.int



Present	Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Comunidad Andina (CAN)	<b>Ms Katty Rojas Quiroga</b> RESPONSABLE ESPECIALISTA EN SANIDAD VEGETAL	krojas@comunidadandina.org;
	Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)	<b>Mr César De La Cruz</b> Director General de Sanidad Vegetal, del Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agraria (SENASA) -Presidente del Comité Directivo del COSAVE 2020-2021 Av. La Molina 1915, La Molina, Lima Perú Tel:(+511) 313-3300 Anexo 6101	cdelacruz@senasa.gob.pe asist_tecnico@cosave.org
	Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)	<b>Mr Efraín MEDINA GUERRA</b> Executive Director OIRSA Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria ' OIRSA Edificio OIRSA Calle Ramón Bellosa, final pasaje Isolde Colonia Escalón, San Salvador Apdo. Postal (01) 61, San Salvador El Salvador Tel:+503 2263 1127 Mobile:+503 7737 9999 Fax:+503 2263 1128	emedina@oirsa.org; svegetal@oirsa.org
✓	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA)	<b>Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH</b> Plant Health Specialist Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) Letitia Vriesdelaan #10 Paramaribo, Suriname Tel:+ 597 422 546 Mobile:+ 597-725-2922	juliet.goldsmith@cahfsa.org; rppe.secretariat@cahfsa.org
✓	North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)	<b>Ms Stephanie BLOEM</b> Executive Director North American Plant Protection Organization Secretariat 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 145, Raleigh, North Carolina 27606 United States of America Tel:+ 919 617 4040 Mobile:+ 919 480 4761	stephanie.bloem@nappo.org; tita.bloem@gmail.com
✓	Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)	<b>Mr Visoni TIMOTE</b> Executive Secretary Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) Pacific Community (SPC) Pacific Community, Land Resources Division, Private Mail Bag ,Suva, Fiji Tel:(+679) 337 9220 or (+679) 337 0733 Ext:35220	visonit@spc.int; timotev@gmail.com
✓	COSAVE	<b>Mr James PAZO</b>	secretaria_tecnica@cosave.org;
✓	Observer ECOWAS	<b>Mr Benoit GNONLONFIN</b> ECOWAS Department of Industry and Private Sector Promotion & Directorate of Agriculture and Rural Development, ECOWAS Commission, 101, Yakubu Gowon Crescent-Aoskoro, PMB 401, Abuja FCT, Nigeria	bgnonlonfin74@gmail.com; bgnonlonfin@yahoo.fr;

Present	Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
		Tel:+2347084003507 Mobile:+234 7084003507	
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr John Gilmore</b> <b>Implementation Facilitation Officer</b>	John.Gilmore@fao.org;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Sarah Brunel</b> <b>Implementation Facilitation Officer</b>	Sarah.Brunel@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Riccardo Mazzuchelli</b> <b>Integration and Support Team</b>	Riccardo.Mazzuchelli@fao.org;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana Moreira</b> <b>SSU Officer</b>	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Natalie Nicora</b> <b>Implementation Facilitation Officer</b>	Natalie.Nicora@fao.org;